REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of May 17, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. However, the Office is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, each of the claims was rejected on the basis of new grounds of rejection, as noted at pages 5-6 of the Office Action. Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 9-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0118808 over Kelleher, *et al.* (hereinafter Kelleher), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,625,271 to O'Malley, *et al.* (hereinafter O'Malley). Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelleher, in view of O'Malley, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,765,931 to Rabenko, *et al.* (hereinafter Rabenko).

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 6, and 9 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced through the claim amendments.

I.   Applicants' Invention

At this juncture, it may helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, exemplified by amended independent Claim 1, is a method of call conferencing using a voice browser. The method can include establishing a voice browsing session between a calling party and the voice browser provided by a voice server, the voice server interfacing with a telephony network via a gateway. The method further can include establishing a conference so as to conference one or more additional parties into the voice browsing session using an application level component.

The conference can provide a voice communications link between the calling party and other parties, the link established over the telephony network.

Additionally, the method can include dynamically coordinating voice data streams between the calling party and other, additional parties. In particular, the dynamic coordination can be performed using an additional application level component that defines a voice data stream manager. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 6, lines 4-8; p. 7, lines 16-19; and p. 8, line 10 – p. 9, line 15.) This step can generate a single voice data stream by aggregating a voice data stream of the additional party with a voice data stream of the calling party into a single voice data stream. The method further can include sending the single voice data stream for processing to the voice browser.

II.   The Claims Define Over The Prior Art

As already noted, independent Claims 1, 6, and 9 were each rejected as unpatentable over Kelleher in view of O'Malley. Kelleher is directed to a system and method for connecting a group of users via a communications network. Kelleher operates by detecting an "initializing signal from initializing user" which thereby enables the initializing user to select and conference into a call other users selected from a "predefined user group." (Paragraph [0006]; see also paragraph [0017].)

As noted at page 3 of the Office Action, however, Kelleher fails to disclose generating a single voice data stream by aggregating voice data streams of a calling party with those of one or more additional parties, as in Applicants' invention. As further noted at page 3 of the Office Action, Keller also fails to disclose sending the single voice data stream to a voice browser for processing, as with Applicants' invention.

It is stated in the Office Action, though, that these features lacking in Kelleher are nevertheless found in the newly-cited reference, O'Malley. O'Malley is directed to an audio conference platform that includes a data bus, a controller, and an interface circuit.

(See Col. 1, lines 44-48; see also Abstract.) More particularly, O'Malley's interface circuit receives audio signals from a plurality of conference-call participants and provides digitized audio signals in assigned time slots over the bus, which explicitly is a time-division multiplex bus. (See Col. 4, lines 3-55.)

The mechanism by which O'Malley generates "conference audio" is described in a portion cited in the Office Action:

"[A step] is performed to decompress each of the audio signals associated with conference bits that are set. Step 711 performs [automatic gain correction and gain/TLP compensation on the expanded signals from step 710. Step 712 is then performed to sum each of the compensated audio samples to provide a summed conference signal. Since many conference participants may be speaking at the same time, the system preferably limits the number of conference participants whose voice is summed to create the conference audio. For example, the system may sum the audio signals from a maximum of three speaking conference participants. Step 714 outputs the summed audio signal for the conference to the audio processors." (Col. 6, lines 28-37.) (Emphasis Supplied.)

The quoted language reveals important differences between O'Malley and Applicants' invention. A fundamental difference is that O'Malley works exclusively on audio *signals*. As explicitly described, O'Malley decompresses audio signals generated by each participant, performs gain correction and gain/TLP compensation, and then sums the different signals. Nowhere, however, does O'Malley generate or utilize data streams, specifically, voice data streams, as recited in each of independent Claims 1, 6, and 9. Even if it is argued that O'Malley's audio signals are nonetheless digitized, they do not

comprise a data stream that is suitable for processing with a voice browser, as further recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 9.

Moreover, O'Malley's aggregation of audio signals into a single audio signal explicitly requires dedicated hardwired circuitry, particularly the digital signal processors (DSPs) configured to cooperatively function with one another as described in the reference. (See, e.g., Col. 4, lines 16-42.) It follows that O'Malley does not teach or suggest a step utilizing a voice data stream manager, as also recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 9. Applicants' voice data stream manager is an application-level component. Such a component is implemented as software code running on a voice server; it explicitly does not require hardware add-ons. (See, e.g., Specification, p. 6, lines 6-8.) Indeed, Applicants respectfully submit that O'Malley's reliance of dedicated hardwired circuitry for processing physical signals is precisely the opposite of, and in fact, teaches away from data streams controlled by a data stream manager and processed by a voice browser, as in Applicants' invention.

O'Malley's exclusive reliance on hardwired circuitry for processing physical signals rather than data streams highlights yet another fundamental difference between O'Malley and Applicants' invention. As noted above, it is pointed out that Kelleher fails to disclose either sending a single voice data stream to a voice browser or processing the data stream with the voice browser. O'Malley, however, fails to provide this feature, since as already noted, O'Malley processes physical voice signals not data streams. Indeed, O'Malley makes only one brief mention of a browser. (See Col. 3, lines 26-30.) O'Malley's reference to the browser neither teaches nor suggests anything regarding the processing of voice data streams. Because O'Malley does not utilize voice data streams, there can be no basis for inferring that O'Malley's browser has any relation to the processing of voice data streams, as recited in independent Claims 1, 6, and 9.

Accordingly, even when combined, Kelleher and O'Malley fail to teach or suggest every feature recited in amended independent Claims 1, 6, and 9. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1, 6, and 9 define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that whereas the remaining claims each depend from one of the amended independent claims while reciting additional features, the dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 17, 2006

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
Marc A. Boillot, Registration No. 56,164
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 40987
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000

{WP258110;1}